

FREE POISSON ALGEBRAS WITH MAXIMAL WITH A CONTRACTING IDEAL OF A POISSON*

ARTURO ESCOBAR

ABSTRACT. Let \mathcal{P} be a Poisson algebra over a field k of characteristic 0. Let \mathcal{I} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{P} such that \mathcal{I} is a contractible ideal of \mathcal{P} . We prove that \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k if and only if \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k .

KEYWORDS. Poisson algebra, contractible ideal, maximal ideal.

1. INTRODUCTION. Let \mathcal{P} be a Poisson algebra over a field k of characteristic 0. Let \mathcal{I} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{P} such that \mathcal{I} is a contractible ideal of \mathcal{P} . We prove that \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k if and only if \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k .

1. For a Poisson algebra \mathcal{P} over a field k of characteristic 0, let \mathcal{I} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{P} . Before stating the main result we require the following

Lemma 1. Suppose that \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k . Then for every $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $f \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. Suppose that for some $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $f \notin \mathcal{I}$. Then by the maximality of \mathcal{I} , \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k . This proves the lemma.

Lemma 2. Let \mathcal{P} be a Poisson algebra over a field k of characteristic 0. Let \mathcal{I} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{P} such that \mathcal{I} is a contractible ideal of \mathcal{P} . Then for every $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $f \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 1. Let \mathcal{P} be a Poisson algebra over a field k of characteristic 0. Let \mathcal{I} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{P} such that \mathcal{I} is a contractible ideal of \mathcal{P} . Then \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k if and only if \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k .

Proof. Let

(1) \mathcal{P} is a Poisson algebra with separated variables,

(2) \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k ,

(3) \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is a free Poisson algebra over k .

(4) For every $f \in \mathcal{P}$, $f \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{I}$ and $f \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{I}$.

$$(1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) \Leftrightarrow (4)$$

Then (1) and (2) are equivalent, (1) and (3) are equivalent, (1) and (4) are equivalent, (2) and (3) are equivalent, (2) and (4) are equivalent, (3) and (4) are equivalent.

Thus, from (1) we can show that for every $f \in \mathcal{P}$, the ideal \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} is maximal.

*This work is partially supported by the National Science Foundation Grant DMS-0531466.

†The author would like to thank the referee for the useful comments.

‡The author would like to thank the referee for the useful comments.

§The author would like to thank the referee for the useful comments.

To prove the converse, we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$, an integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ and we put

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 &= \min\{\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon - \epsilon^2)\} & (1) \\ \eta_2 &= \min\{\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon - \epsilon^2)\} & (2) \\ \delta &= \min\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2\} & (3) \end{aligned}$$

By (1) there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$x - \delta \leq x \leq x + \delta. \quad (4)$$

From the choice of δ we have $\eta_1 \leq \delta$. Suppose that there exists a positive integer j such that $\eta_1 \leq \delta_j$. Evidently, we may assume that $\eta_1 \leq \delta_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ thanks to the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_j &= \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} \leq \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} + \delta_{j+1} \\ &\leq \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} + \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} = \delta_j. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using (1) and (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1 &= \min\{\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon - \epsilon^2)\} \leq \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta - \delta^2)\} + \delta_{j+1} \\ &\leq \min\{\delta, \frac{1}{2}(\delta - \delta^2)\} + \delta_j \leq \delta_j. \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\eta_1 \leq \delta_j \leq \delta$ holds together with $\eta_1 \leq \delta_j$ indefinitely (in the sequel, in the sense of $\eta_1 \leq \delta_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$), and, consequently, the set $\{\delta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded.

Take now η_2 in (3) and put $\eta_3 = \min\{\eta_2, \delta_{j+1}\}$ (see below)

(3) $\eta_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\eta_3 - \eta_3^2)$ η_3 multiple of δ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Evidently, $\{\eta_3\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a subsequence of the set $\{\delta_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. We shall prove that $\{\eta_3\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ has Cauchy property.

From our recursive steps from (3) we have

$$\eta_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\eta_3 - \eta_3^2) = \eta_3.$$

Denote $\eta_j = \min\{\eta_3, \delta_{j+1}\}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and write

$$\delta_j = \min\{\eta_j, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\}.$$

For the simplicity of the notation we put $\delta_j = \min\{\eta_j, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\}$. Denote by δ_j that of the numbers $\delta_j, \delta_{j+1}, \dots, \delta_{j+2}, \dots$ that is the greatest value that δ_j (through inequality) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_j &= \min\{\eta_j, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} \leq \eta_{j+1} + \delta_{j+1} \leq \delta_{j+1} \\ &= \min\{\eta_j, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_j - \delta_j^2)\} \leq \eta_{j+2} + \delta_{j+2} \leq \delta_{j+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now (1) and (2) apply

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2}, \mathbb{P}^{\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2}) \\ &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) \end{aligned}$$

is,

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2).$$

Repeating this procedure, we see that positive integers $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_1 + \dots + n_k = k$, exist such

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1).$$

Since, there is no ordering on states

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1)$$

where it denotes the distance of the state $(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1)$ to $(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \mathbb{P}_1$. The power function α is a Cauchy sequence.

By the completeness of \mathbb{R} there exists a $\alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha$. We need show that for $n = \alpha$, $\mathbb{P}^n = \alpha$.

For an arbitrary point suppose there is $\alpha(\mathbb{P}^n) < \alpha$. Using the argument of the preceding part of the proof, we find

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n+k}) = \alpha.$$

Therefore, by the lemma, there exists n_0 such that

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0}) \leq \alpha < \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0+1}), \quad \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0+1}) \leq \alpha < \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0+2}), \quad \dots$$

Choose $n = n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0}) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathbb{P}^{n_0}) = \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0}, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) \\ &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) \\ &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0}) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha$, $\mathbb{P}^{n_0} = \mathbb{P}^n = \alpha$. $\alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0+1}) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0}) = \alpha$. $\alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha$ follows that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}^{n_0+k}) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha.$$

Therefore, by \mathbb{P}_1

$$\alpha \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha < \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha.$$

which is a contradiction. Consequently, $\mathbb{P}^n = \alpha$.

Suppose that there is a point $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\mathbb{P} = \alpha$, we are done. If $\mathbb{P} \neq \alpha$ with $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, then by \mathbb{P} and the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}) &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathbb{P}^n) \leq \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2, \dots, \mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}_1) \\ &= \alpha(\mathbb{P}_1) = \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This construction proves that α is unique fixed point of F^2 .

— Since $Z_0 = F^2 Z_0$, just proceed inductively until $Z_0 = \alpha$. Now it is clear that α is the unique fixed point of F .

— To prove the last statement of Theorem 1 take an $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, ε an integer $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ $\varepsilon > 0$ $\varepsilon < \delta$ and put

$$z_j = \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^{2j} \alpha - \alpha}{F^{2j} \alpha - \alpha}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots$$

Suppose that, for some k , $z_k \in \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon)$. Then, using F^2 , F^4 and F^2 in the Lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z_{2k} &= \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha}{F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha} \\ &= \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^2(F^2 z_k - F^2 \alpha)}{F^2(F^2 z_k - F^2 \alpha)} \\ &= \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^2 z_k - F^2 \alpha}{F^2 z_k - F^2 \alpha} = \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{z_k - \alpha}{z_k - \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This construction proves that $z_j \in \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon)$ $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Hence, using F^2 and F^4 , we have

$$z_{4k} = \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^8 z_k - F^8 \alpha}{F^8 z_k - F^8 \alpha} = \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^4(F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha)}{F^4(F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha)} = \alpha + \varepsilon \frac{F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha}{F^4 z_k - F^4 \alpha}$$

and so $j = 1, 2, \dots$. This yields $z_j \in \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon)$ and, in view of $F^2(\mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon)) \subset \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon)$, this completes the proof.

Remark 1. Note that we have not assumed the continuity of F .

2. The simple consequence of Theorem 1 is stated in the following

Proposition 1. Let \mathcal{D} be a complete metric space, $F: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ $\alpha = F(\alpha)$. If γ is continuous, $\mathcal{D}(F, \gamma) \neq \emptyset$ $\mathcal{D}(F, \gamma) = \mathcal{D}(F, \gamma)$ $F^2(\mathcal{D}(F, \gamma)) \subset \mathcal{D}(F, \gamma)$ and for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, ε an integer $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon < \delta$ $\varepsilon < \delta$,

$$\mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$$

then F has unique fixed point $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$. Moreover, for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 2. Taking in Theorem 1 $\alpha = 0$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we obtain F, \mathcal{D} unique fixed point theorem in which the assumption of the continuity of F is removed (cf. [9]).

For $\alpha_j = -\varepsilon$ $\mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) = \mathcal{D}_j = \{x \in \mathcal{D} \mid x = \alpha_j + \varepsilon y, y \in \mathcal{D}\}$. Theorem 1 yields the following

Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{D} be a complete metric space and let $F: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ satisfy the following condition. For each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, ε an integer $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varepsilon < \delta$ and $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{D}$, $j = 0, 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) &\neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) \\ &\neq \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{D}$ is any integer and for $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{D}$, $j = 0, 1$ then F has a unique fixed point $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$. Moreover, for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{D}(F, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{D}(F^2, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

Recently B. Isac [1], generalizing the results of S. M. Edel [4] and L. Khavinson [5] has obtained an analogous result but there F is assumed to be continuous with $\|d + \delta\| \leq r \leq 1$.

Remark 4. L. P. Gerasimov [6] noted that in [4] the continuity of F is superfluous. He suggested an interesting reformulation of Edel's result. In a similar way we can formulate our Theorem 3-4.

THEOREM. Let $X = [a, b]$, $d(x, y) = |x - y|$, $F(x) = \alpha(x) + \beta$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ or $\alpha(\xi) = \beta$ for $a \leq \xi \leq b$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r^n M = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r^n \frac{d}{dx} \frac{F^n(x)}{F^n(x)} = \beta \quad \text{for } r \geq 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta = \beta(x) = \alpha$$

and

$$d(F, G) = \left| \frac{1}{x+1} - \frac{1}{x-1} \right| = \frac{2}{1 + \frac{1}{|x|} + 1} \leq \frac{2}{1 + \frac{1}{|x-1|}} = \alpha(x, \beta).$$

Thus all the assumptions of Theorem 3 are fulfilled, but that is not the case for Theorem 4. To see this suppose that there are assumptions, i.e. satisfying conditions of Theorem 3. Then for $r = 0$ we obtain

$$r \frac{d}{dx} \frac{F^n(x)}{F^n(x)} \leq \alpha \left(r - r \frac{d}{dx} \frac{F^n(x)}{F^n(x)} \right) + \alpha \left(r \frac{d}{dx} \frac{F^n(x)}{F^n(x)} + r \right) + \alpha, \quad \alpha = \alpha(x, \beta) \geq 0.$$

Hence $(r+1) \leq r + \alpha(x) = r + \beta \leq 2 - \beta(x) + \alpha(x)$ for $r \geq 0$ and, consequently, $2\beta + r \geq 1$. This contradiction proves that Theorem 4 is stronger than the results of [1]-[6].

REMARK 5. Suppose that $F: X \rightarrow X$ and there is a point $p \in X$ such that $\|d(F^n(x, p))\|$ tends to 0 uniformly in X . For an $\alpha \geq 0$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ or $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a positive integer $n = n(\varepsilon, \beta)$ such that for all $r \in [0, 1]$, $d(F^n(x, F^n(x))) \leq \alpha(r, F^n(x))$. Using this result one can easily construct an example of a mapping F satisfying all the conditions of Theorem 3 and such that for every α , F^n is discontinuous.

REFERENCES

1. B. Isac, *Fixed point theorems for mappings with a contractive factor at a point*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **102**(1984), 677-681, MR84d:54018.
2. S. M. Edel, *A generalization of Edel-Khavinson's fixed point theorem*, Math. Science Notes **10**(1985), 1-14.
3. L. P. Gerasimov, *On the fixed point theorems of Edel-Khavinson*, Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Math. **47**(1983), 101-104, MR84d:54018.
4. S. M. Edel, *A fixed point theorem for mappings with a contractive factor*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **72**(1978), 433-434, MR80d:54018.